

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sun 05/07/2026 21:36
To: Norwich to Tilbury NorwichtoTilbury@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Subject: Deadline 6 Submission Clare Lanham – [REDACTED] Interested Party Reference: [REDACTED]

Deadline 6 Submission

Clare 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 having reviewed the discussions that took place during Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3, I wish to provide the following submission in support of my continued objection to the compulsory acquisition of rights affecting [REDACTED]

Although I was unable to attend Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3 due to a prior commitment, my position remains unchanged and I fully support the submissions made by my husband, [REDACTED], on behalf of our family and our farming business.

The impact on our home

During Open Floor Hearing 4, I explained that this proposal does not simply affect agricultural land.

It affects our home.

The proposed access route would enter through our main residential gateway and pass within only a few metres of our front door before continuing into the farm.

This is not a remote corner of a field.

This is where my husband and I are raising our children.

It is where they play.

It is where they should feel safe and secure.

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

The issue is not how often the access may be used.

The issue is that rights are being sought through our home environment at all.

As a mother, I have serious safeguarding concerns.

I have concerns regarding privacy and security.

The proposal fundamentally changes how we are able to live in and enjoy our own home.

For more than two years we have lived with uncertainty over whether access rights will be imposed through our home.

That uncertainty has had a significant impact on our family and our mental wellbeing.

A less harmful alternative exists

The point I keep coming back to is a simple one.

We are not saying National Grid cannot access the land.

We are asking why they need to access it through our home.

For approximately two years we have consistently identified an alternative access route.

That route uses the existing public highway directly to the field where the proposed pylon is situated and a gateway that National Grid already has permission to use.

It avoids our residential entrance.

It avoids our front garden.

It avoids the safeguarding concerns.

It avoids many of the privacy and biosecurity concerns.

Most importantly, it avoids turning our family home into an access route.

Despite repeatedly raising this alternative, National Grid has never provided us with any explanation whatsoever as to why it cannot be adopted.

Compulsory Acquisition

Although I was unable to attend Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3, I have carefully considered the matters discussed.

Having done so, I remain of the view that National Grid has not demonstrated that the compulsory acquisition of rights over our home is either necessary or proportionate.

The Applicant has not explained why rights through our home are required when a significantly less harmful alternative exists.

In addition, the continuing discussions regarding the possible relocation of the permanent access demonstrate that the current proposal cannot be regarded as the only available option.

Transparency

Throughout this examination, we have repeatedly asked for information regarding the intended use of the proposed permanent access and the reasons why our alternative access route has not been accepted.

We have never received any explanation whatsoever.

As affected landowners, we believe we should have a clear understanding of exactly what rights are being sought over our home and why.

Transparency is fundamental to the examination process, and it is disappointing that important information discussed during the hearings has not been shared with us despite our requests.

Conclusion

My family has never sought to prevent the Norwich to Tilbury project from proceeding.

We simply ask that it is delivered in a way that avoids unnecessary harm where a practical alternative already exists.

I respectfully ask the Examining Authority to take into account the significant impact this proposal would have on our family home, our children, our privacy, our wellbeing and our farming business.

Most importantly, I ask that careful consideration is given to the alternative access route that has been available throughout this process and for which no explanation has ever been provided as to why it cannot be used.

For these reasons, I respectfully submit that National Grid has not demonstrated a compelling case for the compulsory acquisition of rights affecting [REDACTED], and I ask the Examining Authority not to recommend those powers in their current form.

Clare Lanham

Interested Party Reference: [REDACTED]