

From: [REDACTED]
To: [South East Anglia Link](#)
Subject: SEA LINK
Date: 18 September 2026 13:43:39

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Dear Secretary of State

SEA LINK : THERE IS A CHEAPER, FASTER ALTERNATIVE

I am writing following your letter of 28th August requesting further information from several parties in relation to the Sea Link DCO. I feel compelled to write following two recent reports from Ofgem and the National Audit Office which raise serious questions about the cost, deliverability and value for money of the proposed Sea Link project.

I am in favour as a pensioner in reducing household energy bills and those of industry but at what cost. The National Audit Office have highlighted in their recent report: VALUE FOR MONEY UPGRADING THE ELECTRICITY NETWORK that all major projects are proportionate and provide genuine value for money for all consumers. I am asking you to look closely at the proposed Sea Link project in East Suffolk which illustrates many of the concerns identified by the NCO.

Ofgem has now assessed Sea Link at approximately £3.2 billion this is now around 3 times the cost presented at the DCO.

This raises serious concerns about the reliability and transparency of the information presented at the DCO examination. The £1.1 billion figure presented now appears totally unrealistic in the light of new information and needs further scrutiny. How was a project of this scale examined without decision makers and affected communities being given realistic cost analysis.

Furthermore the circumstances underpinned the original plan for Sea Link have changed, the project was developed around an assumed 1,852MW export deficit at Friston associated with the proposed Nautilus inter connector. Nautilus was subsequently relocated away from Friston before the Sea Link application was submitted reducing the apparent deficit to approximately 352MW.

Further concerns raised by Ofgem are unresolved harmonic issues which may require additional work elsewhere on the transmission network before Sea Link can operate compliantly at its intended 2GW. To get to the heart of this matter is what is the true need and total cost to consumers of delivering Sea Link in the light of all this information?

More importantly and significantly there is a cheaper and faster alternative.

During the DCO examination Suffolk Energy Solutions SEAS identified an alternative based on upgrading and re conducting existing pylon corridors in Suffolk and Kent. Estimated to cost under £300 million compared to with the £3.2 billion and rising for Sea Link. Saving consumers a figure approaching if not exceeding £3 billion.

Not only a saving in cost but time as this could be delivered more quickly while making better use of existing infrastructure and thereby avoiding much of the new onshore infrastructure. Factoring in the environmental damage and disruption to local communities that Sea Link entails this alternative must be considered a viable and relevant cost effective solution.

This matters to me as a resident of East Suffolk. The cumulative effect of so much proposed infrastructure, the environment cost in an area of outstanding natural beauty, the invaluable tourist trade where so many business depend and where employment in this sector is vital to local communities. These are considerations that must take precedence as the need for Sea Link is questioned, examined further and scrutinised microscopically for transparency.

I support the aims of transitioning towards Net Zero and realise the need for investment in Britains electricity network. But this needs countering on whether spending billions in times of economic fragility is prudent when

there is an alternative that demands proper examination. Before consumers are committed to expenditure of £3.2 billion or more on Sea Link I 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 the Sea Link £3.2 billion proposal it is imperative that this project should be properly examined. Consumers money needs to be invested wisely in this respect.

Yours sincerely

Elizabeth Bennett

