


South East Anglia Link

Dear Secretary of State,

Congratulations on your appointment and on your sensible statements on energy so far. Please reconsider the following:

SEA LINK – PLEASE LOOK AT CHEAPER LESS DAMAGING ALTERNATIVES

I write to you as a supporter of Net Zero and green energy BUT in response to your letter of 28 August, 2026 I want to impress on you a few highly salient points for your consideration.

1. Ofgem and the National Audit Office, raise serious questions about the cost, deliverability and value for money of the proposed Sea Link project.
2. The new Government has a commitment to reducing household energy costs. So let's be sure that the billions of pounds required will be spent on necessary, excellent value, proportionate value for money projects.
3. Please agree to take seriously the NAO report, **Value for Money – Upgrading the Electricity Transmission Network**, which clearly illustrates legitimate concerns which should be taken seriously about the **Sea Link project in East Suffolk**.
 - a. Ofgem has now assessed Sea Link at approximately **£3.2 billion – approx three times the cost presented during the DCO examination** when NG estimated it at **£1.1 billion**. **SEAS and others estimated, then, that the true cost would be £3.2 million. Ofgem agrees. One wonders why the figure of £1.1m remained in discussion for so long. This is not transparent and honest. PLEASE AGREE TO LOOK AGAIN AT THE**

TRUE COST OF THIS ONE PROJECT. Has NG been equally inaccurate in all its estimates?

b. This raises serious concerns about the reliability and transparency of the information presented during the Examination. **National Grid presented an estimated project cost of approximately £1.1 billion, despite SEAS challenging that figure and presenting evidence that the true cost was likely to be around £3.2 billion. Ofgem has now assessed Sea Link at approximately £3.2 billion, broadly confirming the figure put forward by SEAS.** The £1.1 billion figure presented during the Examination therefore proved wholly unrealistic. **This looks like sleight of hand by NG.**

c. More importantly, the circumstances underpinning the original need for Sea Link have changed. It is now estimated that the apparent deficit in electricity needed is not **1,852MW export deficit at Friston**, which was argued in relation to the proposed Nautilus interconnector. Nautilus has been relocated from Friston where a huge unnecessary interconnector is still planned to go ahead despite a reduced generation deficit to approximately **352MW**.

d. There are further concerns. Ofgem has identified unresolved harmonic issues which may require additional works elsewhere on the transmission network before Sea Link can operate compliantly at its intended 2GW capacity. The precise scope and location of these works have yet to be determined. In addition, identified reinforcement between Richborough and Canterbury in Kent is excluded from NGET's current £3.2 billion Project Assessment submission.

This raises a fundamental question: **what is the true need and total cost to consumers of delivering Sea Link? Most importantly, there is a cheaper, faster alternative.**

During the DCO examination, Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) identified an alternative based on upgrading and reconductoring existing pylon corridor in Suffolk and Kent. This is estimated to cost **under £300 million**, compared with £3.2 billion for Sea Link – a potential saving to consumers approaching **£3 billion**.

The alternative could also potentially be delivered more quickly, while making better use of infrastructure that already exists and avoiding much of the new onshore infrastructure, environmental damage and disruption to communities associated with Sea Link. I live beside the SEALINK planned onshore cable, which will up our natural environment, disturbing and killing (roadkill) badgers, deer and muntjacs, upsetting our visiting tourists as we can see already with the impact of Sizewell C construction of

roads and rail. The destruction will be cumulative and destructive. And It is not necessary.

I fully support the transition to Net Zero and recognise that Britain's electricity network needs substantial investment. But achieving Net Zero should not mean spending billions of pounds on new infrastructure without first properly examining whether the same network need can be met **more quickly and at a fraction of the cost by upgrading existing infrastructure.**

Before consumers are committed to expenditure of £3.2 billion or more on Sea Link, I therefore urge the Government to ensure that the SEAS alternative is **independently and transparently assessed against Sea Link on cost, delivery time, network capacity and environmental impact.**

If a solution costing under £300 million can deliver the required network reinforcement faster than a £3.2 billion project, **surely it should be properly examined before billions of pounds of consumers' money are committed.**

Yours sincerely,

Trudy Klauber

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Trudy Klauber.