

From: [REDACTED]
To: [East Anglia ONE North](#); [East Anglia Two](#)
Subject: Update to oral submission: Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 16th February 2021
Date: 24 February 2021 15:36:39

Unique Ref:EA1N – AFP128, EA2 – AFP130

Dear Examining Authority,

I spoke at the above Hearing on 16th Feb 2021, I oppose the Applicant's intention to acquire Permanent Rights to the verges and subsoil under the Church Road/Church Lane, Friston, public highway; this abuts the northern boundary of my property (and indeed abuts the northern boundary of the graveyard of St Mary's Church). I indicated that I would follow up and expand my oral objections by this written submission.

Before I spoke at the Hearing I listened very carefully to the Chairman's opening remarks particularly those concerning the privacy issue and compensation. I was obliged therefore, to adapt my oral submission, which I believe affected the flow of my presentation. I am still unclear how I should proceed but I am sure of one thing: I do not want my personal and private financial business aired in the public domain. I do think however, that the Planning Authority should be made aware of these issues and the on-going pressures I am now obliged to endure. Therefore I have decided to put these issues and concerns together outside of the main thrust of my arguments. I leave you to redact any personal information that you think appropriate. I am [REDACTED] this year, I have no way of knowing of how long physically or mentally I will be able to present my case! I have no wish for my heirs to inherit mess and uncertainty regarding boundary issues as I understand the planning process, from application to possible fruition, may span many years.

As I explained at the Hearing, near to the northern boundary of my property there are key utilities and buildings: oil tank, electricity, water: fresh and foul, a summer house and drive way, both of which required planning permission from the Council, green houses, sheds, plus two large concrete tanks from a defunct cess pit/sewage management system. I need to know **how** and **if** these may be affected by the Applicant's proposals. The Applicant has consistently failed to supply me with information. I think this is grossly unfair and this is further adding to the stress of living with the prospect of major construction works happening on my doorstep. This feels to me like having an on-going boundary dispute where one of the parties is unwilling to resolve the situation – with me being the innocent party, left in limbo, owning a property which is, if not unsaleable, is certainly difficult to market. I feel that the Applicant has been discourteous to me on two counts. Firstly, having failed to pre-inform me that I was to be mentioned in the original Book of Reference and secondly having failed to respond in detail to my letter of 23rd October 2020. I sent this letter on the advice of [REDACTED], who suggested I contact the Applicant; in this letter I suggested that we might have an on-site visit to discuss matters further, and bearing in mind the legal issues, I would be accompanied by a third party. I do accept that Covid restrictions have affected visits but I still hoped for further clarification on these issues. More recently an additional pipe route (water from the substation site) has been proposed by the Applicant which not only complicates the issue but further has impacts on my property.

The second point in my oral submission on 16th February 2021 was one of principle: in essence I took the view that the verge and subsoil in a UK thoroughfare could only be owned by the UK Government, therefore, as a UK citizen, it would be against the National interest if I was to act in

any way to undermine this position (actively or by default). I am of the view that the same argument would apply to any other essential National infrastructure which would include: railways, rivers, canals, ports, hospitals and water supplies etc. The only exception I know of is that of an officially recognised foreign embassy. NB USAF bases in the UK are always known as RAF eg RAF Upper Heyfield and RAF Greenham Common. Clearly a lease arrangement is permissible but only with the controls and conditions set out by HM Government, none of these are permanent arrangements. In the case of the Church Road/Church Lane public road the Applicant is seeking permanent rights and control over, one section of this road ie. Church Lane; Why? One is owned by the Council and the other by no-body. Should the Applicant be successful in acquiring rights vis-a-vis Church Lane, what safeguards would be in place from selling on these rights to a third party? The potential buyer, in this case, could be a foreign state or a foreign individual. What would be the avenue of appeal for a UK citizen, public body, Council or even the UK Government itself if they were to object? In stark contrast, in the case of Church Lane, owned by Suffolk County Council/Highways, a clear appeal path would be evident – Parish Council, to District Council, etc up to the Government.

I covered further issues of ownership in my oral submission. The Covid pandemic has thrown matters of ownership into focus and confusion eg who owns the vaccines? Is it the owner of the intellectual property, the drug company, manufacturer or the country in which it is produced? Why the unseemly debate? It is possibly to do with the health of a nation's citizens and the speed of its population's recovery from Covid. Both of these issues are clearly of National interest if not matters of National security. Undoubtedly these are tricky issues and will be difficult to address, but address them we must. In doing so other fundamental problems need to be considered by independent democratic states. Not least of these is the question 'are the extant systems of Government up to the task?' and 'are they fit for purpose in this modern age'? Do we need to re-examine the fundamental building blocks necessary to construct a contract of rights and responsibilities between our independent state and its citizens? I say we do, hence the significance of a tiny minor road in Suffolk.

Mike Lewis.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10