

**EDWARD Wright** [REDACTED] >

South East Anglia Link

[REDACTED]

To: The Rt Hon Miatta Fahnbulleh MP

Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero

Re: Sea Link - Request for Information

Dear Secretary of State

I am writing further to your letter of 28th August requesting further information in relation to the Sea Link DCO. Two recent reports, from The National Audit Office (NAO) and Ofgem raise a number of concerns about the cost and value for money of Sea Link and the effectiveness of the regulator.

The recent NAO report (11/09/26) exposes weaknesses in the existing system which need to be addressed if the Great Grid Upgrade is to achieve value for money. These weaknesses include stronger oversight and transparent monitoring to scrutinise costs. The report recommends that Ofgem assess the effectiveness of its regulatory approach in protecting consumers.

Ofgem assesses Sea Link at £3.2 billion - roughly three times the £1.1 billion cost presented at the DCO examination. Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) pointed out that the time that this figure was far too low and put forward an estimate of £3.2bn. The figure given by National Grid at the examination was therefore completely unrealistic.

Sea Link was designed on the basis of a 1,852 MW export deficit at Friston but now it appears that the deficit is 352 MW.

Ofgem has also identified unresolved harmonics issues that need to be resolved.

SEAS has identified an alternative to Sea Link, based on using exiting pylon corridors. This could save consumers a figure of almost £3bn.

I also have grave concerns about the LionLink project at Walberswick. This will, according to Ofgem operate mainly as an export route to The Netherlands, increasing our wholesale electricity prices.

In light of the NAO'S recommendations I do hope you will arrange for a reassessment of the cost of and need for LionLink against current 2026 evidence rather than continuing to regard that case as established by the 2024 regulatory decision.

The latest proposed LionLink landfall site at Walberswick is unsuitable because it is far too close to houses and will be disruptive to wildlife, residents and tourists, in particular:

Noise, vibration and dust will be a constant issue.

There will be traffic disruption on the dead end road that is the only way into and out of the village.

Footpaths used by thousands of visitors each year will be disrupted

The proposed site is close to protected habitats

The village depends on tourism and the pubs, cafes and shops will suffer from the reduction in the number of visitors.

I support the aim of achieving net zero but this must be done without wasting money. I do hope you will arrange an independent assessment of SEAS' alternative.

I also hope you will reassess the economic and consumer case for LionLink in the light of current evidence.

Finally, offshore solutions and the use of existing infrastructure should be considered.

Thank you for considering my suggestions.

Yours sincerely

Edward Wright

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Edward Wright.