

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing in response to your letter of 28 August regarding the SeaLink Development Consent Order.

The National Audit Office (NAO) report of 11 September 2026 raises serious questions about the cost and value for money of current energy infrastructure investment, and whether Ofgem's regulatory approach is adequately protecting consumers while facilitating necessary network upgrades. These concerns are particularly relevant to the proposals in East Suffolk.

Ofgem's assessment indicates that the cost of SeaLink is now approximately three times the figure previously presented. This concern was already identified by Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) during the DCO examination, including an alternative involving the re-conductoring of existing pylon corridors, estimated at under £300 million. If viable, this could potentially save consumers around £3 billion. Given the scale of expenditure involved, such alternatives require proper independent and transparent assessment.

There are equally important questions surrounding LionLink, including its economic and consumer case and its substantial environmental implications for East Suffolk. I trust that the NAO's recommendations will lead to a reassessment based on current information and that greater consideration will be given to coordinated offshore solutions, which may reduce both infrastructure on land and costs to consumers.

Walberswick and the proposed G3 site

As a resident of Walberswick, I am particularly concerned by the proposed G3 landside location. Homes immediately adjoin the proposed site boundary, making this fundamentally different from an infrastructure project located at a reasonable distance from residential properties.

The proposed two-year construction period, including 24-hour drilling and significant noise and light pollution, would have a direct and disproportionate impact on residents, wildlife and the village's character. This is not simply an environmental objection; it is a matter of where people live and the environment in which they are expected to continue living.

Walberswick's dark skies, tranquillity and exceptionally low levels of noise and light pollution are central to its character and to the tourism on which local businesses, holiday accommodation and pubs depend. These qualities would be severely compromised by prolonged construction immediately beside residential properties.

The cumulative environmental impact also cannot be considered in isolation. Wildlife in the area is already under pressure from the long-term Sizewell C development. Further major infrastructure must therefore be assessed in the context of the combined impact on this particularly sensitive part of the Suffolk coast.

There are also significant health and safety considerations. The B1387 is the village's only access road and is already heavily congested during peak holiday periods. It has no street lighting and no footpaths along significant sections. Additional construction traffic would place further pressure on this constrained route and could affect emergency access when blue-light services are required.

I therefore urge that G3 is not treated simply as another technical landing option. Its immediate proximity to homes, the unique character of Walberswick, its dependence on tourism, constrained road access and the cumulative pressure already being placed on the area require a much more rigorous assessment of its suitability.

Before further commitments are made, I ask that the SeaLink alternatives identified during the DCO examination, the current economic and consumer case for LionLink, and the potential for coordinated offshore solutions are independently and transparently reassessed.

The scale of the expenditure and the permanence of the infrastructure make it essential that the least damaging and most cost-effective solutions are properly considered — for consumers, for the environment and, importantly, for the communities who will have to live alongside them.

Yours sincerely,

Sue Wood