
Sea Link ExQ2 response

From [REDACTED]
Date Wed 2026-02-25 21:04
To South East Anglia Link <SouthEastAngliaLink@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

[REDACTED]
Dear Sirs

I am responding to the ExA's 2Gen2 appeal to all parties for formal written submissions on open issues surrounding "Need" in its 25 February 2026 ExQ2 response "2Gen2"

My concern on Need continues to be that my understanding is that by far the greatest amount of power generation on the East Suffolk coast will come from Sizewall B & C. The consented EA1N and EA2 Windfarms – and the unconsented proposed Lionlink interconnector from the Netherlands – would only add a contribution that is small relative to the combined output from these two huge nuclear plants when both are fully operational in the late 2030's or early 2040's. I was also advised in the applicant's pre application consultation meetings that one of NESO's concerns was for the Applicant to provide – through Sealink – for an alternative route to the existing overhead cables for East Suffolk power to be distributed across the Grid (dual routing) – a commendable objective.

What I have never seen properly justified by the applicant or by NESO is given that dual routing objective then why not connect Sealink to the National Grid directly within the Sizewall site which of course fronts the North Sea only 3 miles north of the proposed cable landfall at Aldeburgh. Originally the applicant did seek to justify the decision to leave the Sizewall power single routed (ie transmitted down just one set of overhead cables) from the Sizewall site to Friston on the basis that there was not enough space within the Sizewall site for the necessary transmission infrastructure (specifically the equipment required for the AC/DC conversion). This was always a weak argument and the way the Applicant stated it gave me no confidence at all that the Applicant had in anyway tested and pushed back on the original "no room" feedback from EDF (the Sizewall B & C site owner) and from the Sizewall A owners (if the latter were even asked?) But as I pointed out in my submission to the initial hearings last November, it was announced in June last year that an area the size of a football pitch had been cleared at Sizewall and freed up for future use following early removal of old – non-nuclear – turbine hall buildings at the former Sizewall A. See [Regulator welcomes completion of 18-month project to demolish Sizewall A turbine hall | Office for Nuclear Regulation](#)

My concern on Need is that, now there is clearly space available within the Sizewall site for the required AC/DC conversion infrastructure, NESO and the Applicant's reasons for selecting Sealink's grid connection at Friston rather than at Sizewall seem to – at best - have been overtaken by events (or maybe they simply didn't pursue the landfall at Sizewall option properly in the first place?) . But given the ability by relocating the Suffolk landfall cable point slightly further north to provide full dual routing for all Sizewall generated power, why is this apparent opportunity to better meet at least one aspect of the identified "Need" objectives for Sealink not being pursued?

To date the Applicant has not, to my knowledge, addressed this comment and I would respectfully request the ExA to ensure that – at very least – they respond to it as without their response this aspect of the "Need" case will not have been properly considered.

Please confirm safe receipt of my response to the ExA's call for written submissions on Need related questions.

Stuart Ian Robson
[REDACTED]