



By email to: SouthEastAngliaLink@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

The Sea Link Examining Authority
The Planning Inspectorate
QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough SL1 4PN

Date: 4 March 2026
Your ref: Sea Link EN020026
Our ref: [REDACTED]

Dear Sarah Holmes and the Examining Authority Team,

RE: ExQ2 question 2GEN1

SEAS Clarification Addendum to [REP4-156] - SEA LINK does not resolve the SC2 transfer deficit identified in the Applicant's needs case.

1. In light of ExQ2 question 2GEN1, we are writing to provide additional clarification relating to SEAS's Deadline 4 submission on "Need" (REP4-156), with the intention of further assisting the ExA's ongoing assessment and to inform the Applicant's Deadline 5 response.
2. In Appendix A of REP4-156, we outline how more straightforward grid upgrade solutions, can fully resolve the N-1 "worst case fault" "need" scenarios in both Suffolk and Kent, for a fraction of the cost of Sea Link. Namely, by reconductoring the existing 55km overhead-line (OHL) Sizewell to Bramford double circuits - works that are required in any event on a lifecycle maintenance basis ahead of Sizewell C becoming fully operational - together with the provision of a new 29 km 400kv double-circuit OHL routed alongside the existing Canterbury North-Kemsley line.
3. It is important to highlight that not only would these works entirely meet the "worst case fault" need, but that Sea Link itself would not do so. So these low-cost, low-environmental harm solutions offer something, in grid capacity terms, that Sea Link does not.
4. We recognise that we may not have spelled this out clearly in our REP4-156, so we do so now.

5. In particular, in Kent, the N-1 worst case fault scenario transfer deficit of about 6,516 MW across the SC2 boundary would be fully resolved by building a new 400kv double-circuit overhead-line (7,482 MW) alongside the existing double-circuit between Canterbury North and Kemsley, as proposed in Appendix A of REP4-156 and in David Stevens' technical assessment detailed in [REP4-207](#).
6. However, in contrast, Sea Link would only offset that 6,516 MW N-1 worst case fault transfer deficit by 2,000 MW, leaving a substantial residual deficit of 4,516 MW.
7. Sea Link cannot therefore be regarded as a reinforcement that resolves the identified transfer deficit across the SC2 boundary, which forms part of the network constraint relied upon to justify the Applicant's needs case.
8. We trust that this submission will assist both the ExA and the Applicant in their ongoing assessment of the 'Need' case for Sea Link.

Yours sincerely

██████████

Suffolk Energy Action Solutions Ltd