
Core Document
CD2.9

OBJECTIONS TO

THE NATIONAL GRID ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION PLC (PITSMOOR- WINCOBANK-TEMPLEBOROUGH 275 kV CABLE REPLACEMENT SCHEME) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER 2023

Compulsory Purchase of Land and New Rights in Land between Pitsmoor and Wincobank and Templeborough substations

The Electricity Act 1989 and the Acquisition of Land Act 1981

GROUND OF OBJECTION

1. We, Anisa Hussian and Azeem Sharif are the new owners of the residential property situated at [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] We bought the property at the end of November 2023.
2. We have directly received only limited information about the CPO from National Grid in the form of a handwritten note recently placed through our letterbox to which we have responded asking for further details.
3. The above CPO is related to our property as we own the land and property situated at Plot No 8-02 on the CPO Plan.
4. From the documents that we have now seen, it seems that the CPO proposes to acquire Construction and Operational Access Rights in respect of approximately 211 Square metres of our garden and driveway land at [REDACTED] We object to this in the strongest terms.

5. According to the CPO Plan the land from our front (metal) gate opening and accessway/driveway to our house and the pedestrian/vehicular driveway (which we need to access to get to the front door and back door and rear garden of our property) will be used/infringed thus making it not practicable to access our property by pedestrian or vehicular means.
6. Anisa Hussain suffers from a disability which restricts her mobility. She has a blue disabled badge so she can access roads, spaces and buildings without being disadvantaged as a result of her disability. This CPO will mean that she will be unfairly, unreasonably and disproportionately disadvantaged in being able to access and use her own private property.
7. Furthermore, we have a 6 month old baby who was born premature by more than two months and who has particular needs as a developing child who was pre term.
8. The CPO as made would also mean that we will be unable to reasonably use or otherwise enjoy our property (pedestrian/vehicular accessway and driveway and our garden land and features and amenities) without undue interference. The garden greenery, trees, shrubs and hedges and the wildlife that exists there amongst the approximate 211 Square metres of land that the CPO purports to cover, as well as the rest of the garden, was the main reason why this house was acquired by us. To find that this is going to be interfered with, spoiled, removed, damaged is not acceptable or justifiable.
9. Furthermore, the presence of plant, machinery, noisy equipment, workmen/strangers and the noise pollution, environmental impact of the intrusion into our private rights in our land and property and the general disturbance and nuisance of these works on our land is not acceptable.

10. It will also spoil the use of the part of our land/property covered by the CPO as well as the rest of our property and garden, whilst these works are carrying on.
11. We also have specific safeguarding and health and safety concerns due to the particular health and disability needs of Anisa Hussain and also our 6 month old baby child. They need that driveway and garden space without infringement or interference, in Aneesa's case so that her disability and condition does not worsen and in the case of our baby daughter to ensure her proper physical and emotional development and wellbeing, given that she was premature by more than 2 months.
12. The CPO would lead to a breach of our Human Rights under Protocol 1, Article 1, the Right to Peaceful enjoyment of our Property (in contravention of the Human Rights Act 1988 and the European Convention for Human Rights).
13. This breach would lead to a disproportionate interference with our rights which cannot be justified on public policy terms or on the grounds of being necessary in the public interest given the degree of disruption with our human rights as opposed to the public benefit to be gained by wanting to use our property in the manner, way and degree set out in the CPO.
14. We do not accept that a fair balance between our interests as property owners and the wider general interest of society as a whole has been struck by the wording of the CPO as it has been made.
15. The degree of land said to be required by the CPO of 211 Square metres of our driveway and garden is disproportionate and not necessary. The works could be carried out and constructed/accessed via the public footpath that runs to the side of our property being the area under which the existing cables to be replaced are located.

16. The objections raised do not relate exclusively to matters that can be addressed simply by the payment of compensation. They relate to the safeguarding, health and safety and the physical and emotional wellbeing of the property owners/occupants and their family members. They also relate to the welfare of the natural habitat, the trees/shrubs and hedges and wildlife that exists on our property. They also relate to the design and planning of the construction and access works, and the works in general, as it is submitted that the cable removal and replacement works could be carried out without accessing our property.

17. We ask that our objections are duly noted and considered and that they be looked into at a proper hearing or inquiry into the matter.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

4/1/2024

Objectors: Mrs Anisa Hussain and Mr Azeem Sharif

Objectors address:

[REDACTED]

Interest in land:

owners of

[REDACTED]