

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sun 05/07/2026 21:24
To: Norwich to Tilbury NorwichtoTilbury@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Subject: Deadline 6 Submission Dick Lanham – [REDACTED] Interested Party Reference:
[REDACTED]

Deadline 6 Submission

Dick Lanham [REDACTED]

Interested Party Reference: [REDACTED]

Application by National Grid Electricity Transmission for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Norwich to Tilbury Project

Following my participation in Open Floor Hearing 4 and Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3, I wish to provide the following written summary of the points I raised during those hearings, together with further matters that have arisen since.

My objection remains unchanged.

I am not objecting to the Norwich to Tilbury project itself.

My objection is to the compulsory acquisition of rights over our home and farming business at [REDACTED] when a significantly less harmful alternative access route exists.

A viable alternative access route has existed for approximately two years

For almost two years we have consistently identified and promoted an alternative access route.

This alternative uses the existing public highway directly to the field containing the proposed pylon and a gateway that National Grid already has permission to use.

The route completely avoids our residential entrance, our family home and the operational areas of our farm, whilst still providing National Grid with access to exactly the same field.

We have repeatedly supplied plans showing this alternative route to National Grid and Fisher German over a period of approximately two years.

At no stage have National Grid or Fisher German provided any explanation whatsoever as to why this alternative route cannot be used.

Despite repeated requests, no engineering, operational, safety or technical justification has ever been provided.

We have simply been left without any explanation as to why compulsory rights over our home and farming business continue to be pursued instead.

The central question therefore remains unchanged.

It is not whether National Grid requires access.

It is why they require access through our family home and farming business when a practical and significantly less harmful alternative already exists.

Our land agent confirms discussions are still ongoing

Following the hearings we received further correspondence from our land agent, [REDACTED] of Brooks Leney, who has been representing us in discussions with National Grid and Fisher German.

In [REDACTED] email [REDACTED] confirms that discussions are continuing in an attempt to remove the permanent access from [REDACTED] and relocate it onto the neighbouring access track.

Whilst [REDACTED] makes clear there is no guarantee this will be achieved, this correspondence demonstrates that relocating the access remains under active consideration.

If National Grid is still attempting to move the access elsewhere, it follows that the current route cannot reasonably be said to be the only available option.

Yet despite this, National Grid has still provided us with no explanation whatsoever as to why our proposed alternative access route has never been accepted or even properly addressed.

Inconsistent information regarding the intended use of the permanent access

During the meeting held at Ipswich Town Football Club on 29 April 2026, I questioned National Grid regarding the true purpose and extent of the proposed permanent access rights.

In response, National Grid/Fisher German produced a plan for the Examining Authority and explained that, once construction had finished, the permanent access would simply remain for occasional routine maintenance.

This discussion is recorded within the hearing transcript.

However, the Heads of Terms provided to us by Fisher German tell a very different story. (Please see attached)

Section V – Permanent Access Easement, Clause 4 states that National Grid requires entry:

“...for the purposes of construction and associated works and to carry out all works required by the Grantee to construct, lay and render operational the access ways...”

The clause goes on to include:

- * excavation;
- * creation of temporary access roads;
- * resurfacing;
- * testing;
- * protecting works;
- * drainage works; and
- * dewatering works.

These are extensive construction and engineering rights.

They go considerably further than the explanation given during the hearing that the permanent access would simply remain for occasional maintenance purposes.

This apparent inconsistency is extremely concerning because the extent of the rights being sought goes directly to the level of interference with our home and farming business.

Lack of transparency

When National Grid produced the plan during the Ipswich hearing, I immediately requested a copy.

Despite more than eight weeks now having passed, I have still not received it.

Throughout this examination we have repeatedly requested clarification regarding the true intended use of the proposed permanent access.

We have still received no correspondence explaining:

- * exactly what activities the permanent access rights are intended to authorise;
- * whether those rights extend beyond occasional maintenance;
- * why our alternative access route has been rejected; or
- * why National Grid considers compulsory rights through our home to be necessary.

This examination process should be transparent.

As affected landowners we should understand exactly what rights are being sought over our property and why.

Unfortunately, that transparency has been lacking.

The Examining Authority has been shown plans and provided explanations that have never been shared with us as the affected landowners.

Whether the access is temporary, permanent or occasional, the impact is exactly the same

During the hearings National Grid suggested that, following construction, the access may only be required occasionally.

However, this completely misses the point.

Whether the access is temporary, permanent or occasional, the impact on our family is exactly the same.

Every single occasion that vehicles enter through our residential entrance affects our privacy, security and enjoyment of our home.

Every entry creates safeguarding concerns.

Every entry creates biosecurity concerns for our farming business.

Every entry disrupts the operation of our livestock enterprise.

The existence of those permanent rights fundamentally changes how we are able to live in and operate our home and farm.

It is the acquisition of those rights itself that we object to.

The compulsory acquisition tests have not been satisfied

The Applicant must demonstrate that there is a compelling case in the public interest and that the compulsory acquisition of rights is necessary and proportionate.

In our respectful submission, those tests have not been met.

National Grid has not explained why it requires rights through our home when an alternative route exists that reaches exactly the same destination whilst significantly reducing the interference with our private rights.

Indeed, our own land agent has confirmed that discussions are continuing in an attempt to relocate the permanent access away from [REDACTED]

That in itself demonstrates that the current proposal is not the only available option.

Conclusion

Our position has remained consistent throughout this examination.

We are not attempting to prevent National Grid from accessing the pylon.

We are asking the Examining Authority to require the Applicant to use the alternative access route that reaches exactly the same field whilst avoiding unnecessary and disproportionate harm to our family home and farming business.

We respectfully ask the Examining Authority to take into account:

- * the existence of a viable and practical alternative access route;
- * the fact that National Grid has never provided any explanation whatsoever as to why that alternative cannot be used;
- * the continuing discussions regarding relocating the permanent access away from [REDACTED]
- * the inconsistency between the Heads of Terms and the explanation given during the hearing regarding the intended use of the permanent access;
- * the lack of transparency throughout this process; and
- * the unnecessary and disproportionate interference with our home, our family life and our farming business.

For those reasons, we respectfully submit that National Grid has not demonstrated a compelling case for the compulsory acquisition of rights affecting [REDACTED]

We respectfully ask the Examining Authority to refuse the compulsory acquisition powers

affecting [REDACTED] in their current form and to require the Applicant to utilise the alternative access route that has been available throughout this process.

Dick Lanham
[REDACTED]

Reference: NG/FG/N-T/2823
Date of Issue: 9th April 2026

V. PERMANENT ACCESS EASEMENT

1.	Option Agreement/Deed of Grant	The Grantor and The Grantee will enter into an Option Agreement to acquire a permanent Deed of Grant relating to access ways and ancillary apparatus. The Option Agreement will provide that the Grantee can call for a Deed of Grant within the Access Option Area. The Option Agreement will contain rights to lay, install and construct the access ways and ancillary apparatus anywhere within the Access Option Area and rights over the Grantor's Land set out in these heads of terms. During and after construction of access ways, the Grantee shall have the benefit of the rights referenced in the Deed of Grant and the Grantor obligations contained in the Deed of Grant. The Option Agreement will contain an irrevocable power of attorney clause appointing the Grantee as attorney to execute the Deed of Grant. This is to ensure that the Deed of Grant is entered into once the installation of the cable(s) is completed and will only be exercised in the event that the Grantor defaults. Where the Deed of Grant is in perpetuity completion of the Deed of Grant will take place once the access ways and the ancillary apparatus has been installed and the as-built plans showing the route of the access ways are available ("Final Easement Area").
2.	Access Option Area	Shown shaded brown on the Option Agreement Plan(s).
3.	Rights in the Deed of Easement	The Deed of Easement will contain rights to use, maintain, replace the access ways and associated apparatus and will include rights of access and drainage over the Grantor's Land, and restrictions over the land within the Easement to protect the access ways.
4.	Temporary Rights for access ways Installation / Construction Works	The Grantee requires entry onto the Access Option Area for the purposes of construction and associated works and to carry out all works required by the Grantee to construct, lay, and render operational the access ways including without limitation ancillary works of excavation, creation of temporary access roads, resurfacing, protecting, testing and drainage works including any de-watering works. Entry onto the Access Option Area shall be after 14 days written notice (the "Construction Notice") and after the Entry Payment has been made.
5.	Reinstatement	Following completion of the installation of the access ways and all associated apparatus, the Grantee will reinstate the Access Option Area to the Grantor's reasonable satisfaction and to the reasonable satisfaction of the occupier, if applicable and provided that this is not contrary to the Grantor's reasonable satisfaction, having carried out a photographic pre-entry schedule of condition. A copy of the pre-entry schedule of condition will be provided to the Grantor (and the Grantor's Agent) before commencement of construction.
6.	Land Drainage	The Grantor is (where possible) to make available plans of any existing drainage schemes to the Grantee in advance of construction works. The Grantee shall ensure where reasonable and appropriate the land drainage systems on the Grantor's Land are left in no worse condition than before the date of entry for construction and associated works, or if to the extent