

to: The Rt Hon Miatta Fahnbulleh MP, Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero
c/o: Energy Infrastructure Planning Delivery Team, DESNZ
via email: SouthEastAngliaLink@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Subject: Sea Link (EN020026) - Request for information

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to you as someone who has a home in Aldeburgh and who is increasingly concerned about the number and scale of energy infrastructure projects being concentrated in this part of Suffolk.

I completely understand the need to strengthen the electricity network and I support the transition to Net Zero. What I find difficult to understand is why a project as expensive and intrusive as Sea Link should proceed when there appear to be significant questions about both its cost and its underlying need, and when an alternative using existing infrastructure has been put forward.

The figures alone seem to warrant a much closer look. Ofgem has now assessed the cost of Sea Link at around **£3.2 billion**, compared with the approximately £1.1 billion figure presented during the DCO examination. That is a very substantial difference for a project ultimately paid for by consumers.

There also seems to have been a significant change in the circumstances on which the original case for Sea Link was based. The project was developed around an assumed 1,852MW export deficit at Friston linked to the proposed Nautilus interconnector. Nautilus was subsequently moved away from Friston, reducing the apparent deficit to around 352MW.

I am also concerned that there are still unresolved technical issues, including harmonic problems identified by Ofgem which may require additional works elsewhere on the transmission network. Further reinforcement between Richborough and Canterbury is also not included in the current £3.2 billion Project Assessment submission.

This leaves me wondering what the **real cost of Sea Link will ultimately be, and whether the project is still the right solution to the network requirement it was originally designed to address.**

What particularly concerns me is that there appears to be another option. SEAS proposed upgrading and reconductoring the existing pylon corridor in Suffolk and Kent. The estimated cost is under £300 million - a fraction of the cost of Sea Link. If that approach can provide the required network capacity, the difference for consumers is enormous. It could also mean less new infrastructure, less disruption and considerably less environmental impact.

I have a home in Aldeburgh and have seen first-hand how much this area is already being asked to accommodate. I am deeply concerned about the concentration of energy projects in

the immediate area and saddened by the damage and disruption these projects are already having on the landscape and wildlife that make this part of Suffolk so special.

I don't object to renewable energy or to investment in our energy infrastructure. But I do feel that there must be limits to how much one area is expected to absorb, particularly when there are still questions about whether each individual project is necessary and represents good value for money.

Signing off another major project in this area is, frankly, just too much for me. And if there is a credible alternative that could meet the same need for a fraction of the cost and with significantly less environmental impact, I believe it deserves proper independent consideration before Sea Link is approved.

I therefore ask you to look again at the evidence now available and ensure that the SEAS alternative is independently assessed alongside Sea Link, including its cost, deliverability, network capacity and environmental consequences.

This is a very significant decision, both for consumers across the country and for the communities and environment of East Suffolk. I hope you will give the new evidence the careful consideration it deserves before making a final decision.

Yours sincerely,

Jude Neill

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]