

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, 04 May 2026 03:14  
**To:** PCU  
**Subject:** FORMAL OBJECTION TO COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER Property: 33 Princess Court, Cambridge, CB2 1JJ

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://url.uk.m.mimecastprotect.com/s/ffcbCIYkDfyvBz2CGfzUzKd3z?domain=aka.ms> ]

FORMAL OBJECTION TO COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER  
Property: 33 Princess Court, Cambridge, CB2 1JJ

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to formally object to the CPO in relation to my interest in the above-mentioned property.

I am the freehold/long-leasehold owner of the property and have held a continuous interest since 1988. This long term residency and financial commitment should entitle me to a degree of ownership or significant compensation regarding the land itself. I currently reside in the United States, and the property is a vital part of my long-term retirement planning, currently managed through professional letting agents in the UK. I purchased this property as my first home purchase in 1988, however I was deployed over seas with the Air Force in 1995, remaining overseas ever since. I decided to hold on to the property for my retirement home, as it held a lot of sentimental value to me. Even while living overseas I put my heart and soul into this home, faithfully paying every service charge, council tax, maintainance charge, renovating as necessary, all in hope that one day I may be able to retire and return to my first home. I hold very many fond memories in this property and consider it my retirement home and a vital safety net in my non-working retirement years. I am [REDACTED] years old and retirement is quickly approaching, time is very much against me in this matter and with this newly proposed CPO.

**Preliminary Matter: Late Submission**

Due to significant external disruptions, including a temporary government shutdown and associated postal delays, this representation is being submitted outside the prescribed timeframe. I respectfully request that the Secretary of State/Confirming Minister exercises their discretion to consider this objection, as the delay was due to circumstances beyond my control and the impact of the CPO on my fundamental property rights is severe.

**Failure to Demonstrate a Compelling Case in the Public Interest:**

Under the relevant legislation and government guidance, an Acquiring Authority must demonstrate that there is a compelling case in the public interest that justifies overriding my private rights.

I contend that the Authority has failed to provide robust evidence that the public benefits of the proposed scheme, social, economic, or environmental; outweigh the loss of my long-term investment and the displacement of my tenants. The necessity of including 33 Princess Court in the order has not been sufficiently justified, particularly given my history of consistent maintenance and compliance with all statutory obligations.

**Failure to Negotiate by Agreement (Last Resort):**

Government guidance is clear: CPO powers should only be used as a last resort. There is a requirement for authorities to engage in meaningful negotiations to acquire land by agreement before or alongside the CPO process.

To date, I have received no substantive communication or offers to purchase the property by agreement. The lack of any genuine attempt to negotiate or provide a market-value assessment demonstrates that the Authority has moved to compulsory powers prematurely, in breach of procedural expectations.

**Deliverability and Funding Uncertainty:**

For a CPO to be confirmed, the Authority must show that the scheme is deliverable and that the necessary funding is in place. I have serious concerns regarding the financial viability of the proposed redevelopment. If the scheme is not fully funded or faces significant planning hurdles, the use of CPO powers is disproportionate and constitutes an unnecessary blight on my property.

**Consideration of Reasonable Alternatives:**

I do not believe the Authority has adequately explored reasonable alternatives that would avoid the total acquisition of my property. There is no evidence that a redesigned scheme or a management agreement (rather than a transfer of

ownership) has been considered. The burden lies with the Authority to prove that no less-intrusive method exists to achieve their objectives.

**Human Rights and Disproportionate Financial Hardship:**

The proposed CPO represents a significant interference with my rights under Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998 (the right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions).

As an overseas owner, the "Equivalence Principle" of compensation is insufficient to prevent me from suffering a net loss. Specifically:

**- Double Taxation**

A forced sale triggers immediate Capital Gains Tax (CGT) liabilities in both the UK and the USA. The timing of this forced disposal removes my ability to manage these liabilities effectively.

**-Currency Fluctuation**

Compensation paid in GBP must be converted to USD. Given current exchange rate volatility, the "real-world" value of any settlement is likely to be significantly diminished by the time it reaches my accounts, preventing me from reinvesting in an equivalent asset.

**-Social Impact and Tenant Displacement**

The property currently provides high-quality housing for tenants. The CPO will result in the immediate displacement of these residents during a period of acute housing shortage in Cambridge. The Authority has not demonstrated how these residents will be rehoused or how the loss of this private rental stock serves the immediate social well-being of the area.

For the reasons stated above, I request that the CPO is rejected in relation to 33 Princess Court. I remain open to discussing the future of the property, provided such discussions are conducted in good faith and reflect its true market value and my unique circumstances.

I look forward to your acknowledgment of this objection and notification of any upcoming Public Local Inquiry.

Yours faithfully,

