

Good afternoon.

I'm Rhett Griffiths a local resident, with a background in infrastructure project finance.

This application must be judged on Current Need, Proper Alternatives Assessment, and a Reliable Evaluation of Cumulative Impact.

On Need:

Sea Link's Needs Case was Justified on the assumption that Nautilus would connect in the Sizewell area, producing a local network constraint.

BUT Nautilus is no longer part of that local network.

Under EN-1, Need must be based on the network that exists now.

So, Need must be revisited.

The Needs Case also treats LionLink as certain, to justify Sea Link.

But LionLink is not consented, so cannot be treated as real enough to prove Need.

That makes this application premature.

Both these points, independently, fail the EN-1 necessity test.

Need is not demonstrated.

On Alternatives:

Under EN-5, where a less-harmful, technically feasible alternative exists, it must be properly considered.

Brownfield grid connection-locations remain available, yet they were screened out early, before the Need changed.

When Nautilus fell away, the alternatives had to be re-evaluated, but they were not.

The EN-5 proportionality test has not been met.

Under EN-1, it must also be reconsidered, if reinforcement of the existing network, could now meet the same requirement with less harm.

On Cumulative Impact:

The Applicant has excluded Sizewell C, EA1N/EA2, and LionLink from any meaningful cumulative impact assessment, despite consented construction footprints and known overlapping effects.

This understates real cumulative harm and does not meet required EIA Regulation standards.

The ExA therefore has no reliable cumulative baseline on which to judge this application.

In addition, if LionLink is treated as real enough to justify Need, it is also real enough to count towards cumulative harm.

The Applicant cannot have it both ways.

This is a Material Inconsistency at the centre of this application.

In closing:

Granting consent to this flawed application would undermine the purpose of the DCO process: namely to ensure major infrastructure is necessary, proportionate, and sited to minimise harm to communities and the environment.

I ask the ExA to give full consideration to my points in its examination.

Thank you.