

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sun 05/07/2026 21:27
To: Norwich to Tilbury NorwichtoTilbury@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Subject: Deadline 6 Submission Paul Lanham – [REDACTED] Interested Party References:
[REDACTED]

Deadline 6 Submission

Paul Lanham [REDACTED]

Interested Party References: [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 my continuing concerns regarding the compulsory acquisition of rights affecting Dukes Farm.

My objection remains unchanged.

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

My objection relates to the unnecessary and disproportionate interference with my home, my farming business and my livelihood when a significantly less harmful alternative access route exists.

The impact on my home

During Open Floor Hearing 4, I explained that the proposed access route does not simply affect farmland.

It affects my family home.

The proposed access would enter through the front entrance to [REDACTED] and pass within only a few metres of my front door before continuing through the farmyard.

This is the place where my family live and where my children and grandchildren visit.

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

It affects our privacy.

It affects our security.

It creates safeguarding concerns for our grandchildren.

It fundamentally changes the enjoyment of our home.

For more than two years we have lived with the uncertainty surrounding this proposal.

The stress and worry associated with the possible loss of our home environment and our farming business has had a significant impact upon our mental wellbeing.

The impact on our farming business

██████████ is not simply agricultural land.

It is a long-established working family farm which has been built up over more than fifty years.

The proposals threaten every part of that business.

The proposed access would pass directly through our working farmyard and within very close proximity of our commercial turkey enterprise.

Biosecurity is fundamental to the operation of that enterprise.

We have already received written confirmation that if the proposed access arrangements proceed as currently planned, we will lose our turkey enterprise.

This is not a possibility.

It is a direct consequence of the biosecurity implications associated with the proposed access.

The proposals also affect grazing land which is essential to our cattle enterprise.

The loss of that grazing land would make the cattle enterprise commercially unviable.

In addition, the proposed pylons and overhead lines would have a devastating impact upon our fishing lake business.

The fishing lake represents a significant income stream for the farm and the location of the proposed pylons and overhead conductors would fundamentally affect its continued operation.

Taken together, the proposals threaten all three of our principal income streams.

The turkey enterprise.

The cattle enterprise.

The fishing lake.

If the proposals proceed in their current form, the future viability of Dukes Farm is placed in serious doubt.

A less harmful alternative exists

For approximately two years we have identified and promoted an alternative access route which would significantly reduce the impacts upon our home and our farming business.

Plans showing this alternative have been provided to National Grid and Fisher German.

Despite repeated requests, we have never received any explanation whatsoever as to why this alternative cannot be used.

We are not saying National Grid cannot access the land.

We are asking why they need to acquire rights through our home and farm when a significantly less harmful alternative exists.

Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3

During Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 3 I explained that my objection relates specifically to the compulsory acquisition of rights affecting [REDACTED]

I do not believe the Applicant has demonstrated that the proposed interference with my land rights is necessary or proportionate.

The compulsory acquisition powers sought would interfere with my home, my farming business and my livelihood to an extent that is wholly disproportionate.

The Applicant has not demonstrated why these rights are necessary when an alternative route exists that would substantially reduce those impacts.

In my respectful submission, the compulsory acquisition tests have therefore not been satisfied.

Conclusion

My family has spent more than fifty years building [REDACTED] into a successful working agricultural business.

The proposals now before the Examining Authority threaten our home and all three of our principal business enterprises.

We are not attempting to prevent National Grid from delivering this nationally significant infrastructure project.

We are simply asking that the project is delivered in a way that avoids unnecessary and disproportionate harm where a practical alternative already exists.

I respectfully ask the Examining Authority to take into account:

- the severe impact upon my family home;
- the safeguarding, privacy and mental wellbeing concerns;
- the loss of the commercial turkey enterprise;
- the impact upon the cattle enterprise through the loss of grazing land;
- the impact upon the fishing lake business;
- the cumulative loss of all three income streams;
- the existence of a viable alternative access route; and
- the fact that no explanation has ever been provided as to why that alternative cannot be adopted.

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 to refuse those powers in their current form.

Paul Lanham

[REDACTED]