

From: [REDACTED]
To: [South East Anglia Link](#)
Subject: Re: Sea Link final submission
Date: 29 April 2026 17:09:27

[REDACTED]

Please forgive the unfortunate typo! I meant of course to write “ Dear Inspectors”.

- > On 29 Apr 2026, at 17:06, [REDACTED]
 - >
 - >
 - >
 - >
 - >
 - > Dead Inspectors
 - >
 - > I remain implacably opposed to the granting of planning permission for this project.
 - >
 - > This is the wrong project at the wrong time in the wrong place. When Nautilus was moved to Isle of Grain any case for Sea Link fell away and since then the applicant has been scrabbling unsuccessfully to come up with any objective justification which bears even scant scrutiny. We are now left with a possible demand at worst for 352mw not arising until the late 2030s and which could be met by upgrading the pylon lines at a fraction of the cost and minimal disruption and damage to the natural environment. For these and other reasons the case for Sea Link has simply not been made out and the statutory test not met. You should have no hesitation in advising the Secretary of State to refuse consent.
 - >
 - > I will not repeat points I have made before but would just add these short submissions:
 - > 1. Cumulative impact. The coming together of some 7 overlapping projects as a matter of common sense is more than the local population can be expected to bear. The EA1N and EA2 recommendation was described in the inspectors final report as a “ finely judged equation” since when we have Sizewell C , Sea Link, Essex and Suffolk Water, Lion Link , Helios and plans for 800 odd new houses in Saxmundham. We are only in the early stages of 2 of these projects but already the roads are overwhelmed and the peaceful enjoyment of what was tranquil countryside compromised. On a personal note, my wife and I used to sit in our garden in the spring and summer months enjoying birdsong; now we tend to stay in the house to avoid the construction noise. The applicant has manifestly failed to assess the cumulative impact in any meaningful way. SEAS and others have spoken to that and addressed the flawed methodology in what the applicant has put forward.
 - > 2. Need. See above. Through the shifting sands of the applicant’s case no need has been established. SEAS has demolished any case. I wish to adopt but will not repeat what it says. This alone means that a DCO for the project should be refused.
 - > 3. Conduct of the applicant . The repeated failure of the applicant to answer questions by the ExA , the sleight of hand over the Benhall Bridge and demonstrably false explanation to the ExA (see my original submission), the failure to meet deadlines notwithstanding the vast resources, the changing case on need with the applicant forced by other parties to correct what had previously been said to the ExA, all these things should lead the ExA not to take anything said by the applicant at face value and, where questions remain unanswered, an adverse inference should be drawn in accordance with well established legal principles. Should the applicant succeed notwithstanding all these matters a clear message would be given to other developers than they can get away with the same lamentable approach.
 - > 4. AS 167. I submit that you should in any event refuse what the applicant seeks in AS167 which represents a late change and would sideline the Suffolk councils in favour of an untested system.
 - >
 - > I urge you to reject an outdated and unnecessary project which would stand to become a white elephant at huge financial and social cost were it allowed to proceed.
 - >
 - > Yours sincerely
 - >
 - > Anthony Fincham
- [REDACTED]

- > Knodishall
- > IP17 1XB