

The Chaudry Family respectfully maintains its objection to the proposed Development Consent Order ("DCO") and asks the Secretary of State to give significant weight to the unresolved and unjustified impacts that the Scheme will have on their home, land and property interests.

The Family has participated constructively throughout the Examination and has submitted a number of written representations, including REP3-146. Despite that engagement, many of the concerns raised remain unanswered and unresolved. In particular, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the significant interference with the Family's private property rights is necessary, proportionate or supported by adequate mitigation.

The compulsory powers sought through the DCO engage fundamental legal protections afforded to private landowners. It is well established that compulsory acquisition and interference with private property rights should only be authorised where there is a compelling case in the public interest, where the interference is no greater than is reasonably necessary to achieve the legitimate aims of the Scheme, and where all reasonable alternatives and mitigation have been properly considered. Those principles are reflected throughout the Planning Act 2008 regime, the Government's Guidance on Compulsory Acquisition and the protections afforded under Article 8 and Article 1 of the First Protocol ("A1P1") of the European Convention on Human Rights.

In the Chaudry Family's case, the Applicant has failed to satisfy those tests.

Most significantly, during a recent site meeting held on [DATE], the Family discovered for the first time that the Scheme proposes a temporary haul route immediately alongside the boundary of their residential garden for a period of up to seven years. This information had not previously been clearly communicated despite the advanced stage of the Examination and despite the obvious significance of such a proposal to those whose home would be directly affected.

The implications are profound.

A construction haul route operating immediately adjacent to the Family's home for such an extended duration would inevitably result in prolonged noise, dust, vibration, visual intrusion, loss of privacy, vehicle movements, disturbance and a significant deterioration in residential amenity. These are not temporary inconveniences lasting a matter of weeks or months, but impacts capable of fundamentally altering the character and enjoyment of the Family's home for a substantial period of their lives.

The Family's property is not simply an area of land identified on a land plans drawing. It is their home. The right to peaceful enjoyment of one's home lies at the heart of Article 8 ECHR, whilst A1P1 protects the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. Any interference with those rights must be properly justified and shown to be both necessary and proportionate.

The Applicant has not done so.

National Grid has produced no convincing evidence demonstrating why this haul route must be located immediately adjacent to the Family's residential boundary, whether less harmful alternatives have been fully evaluated, or why the resulting impacts cannot reasonably be avoided or materially reduced. Equally, no meaningful package of mitigation has been presented that would lessen the substantial effects on the Family's residential amenity.

Perhaps most concerning is the timing of the Applicant's engagement. The Family became aware of one of the most intrusive elements of the proposals only through a late-stage site meeting during the Examination itself. Such engagement falls significantly short of what affected landowners are entitled to expect during the promotion of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. Meaningful consultation requires affected parties to understand the true impacts of a proposal at a stage when genuine alternatives can still be considered. That opportunity has not been afforded here.

The Examination has repeatedly emphasised the importance of proportionality, justification and transparency. Yet, in respect of the Chaudry Family, the Applicant has not demonstrated why the exceptional level of interference proposed is necessary, why the chosen approach represents the least intrusive option, or why appropriate mitigation has not been secured.

The Secretary of State is respectfully reminded that national need, whilst an important consideration, does not displace the requirement to strike a fair balance between the public interest and the rights of individual landowners. The existence of a wider public benefit cannot justify imposing avoidable and disproportionate burdens on a single family where those impacts have neither been adequately justified nor appropriately mitigated.

The Applicant therefore has not demonstrated that the interference with the Chaudry Family's rights satisfies the tests of necessity, proportionality or fairness required by the Planning Act 2008, compulsory acquisition policy or the European Convention on Human Rights.

For these reasons, the Chaudry Family respectfully invites the Secretary of State to:

attach significant weight to the unresolved impacts identified throughout the Examination;

conclude that the Applicant has failed to justify the proposed interference with the Family's residential property and wider landholding;

refuse development consent in its current form; or

alternatively, require amendments to the Order and associated works that remove or substantially mitigate the impacts on the Family's property before any consent is granted.

The Family remains willing to engage constructively with the Applicant. However, consent should not be granted on the basis of unresolved impacts, inadequate engagement and unsupported assumptions that significant harm to individual landowners can simply be accepted as an inevitable consequence of the Scheme.

Accordingly, the Chaudry Family respectfully maintains its objection to the proposed Development Consent Order.