

From: [REDACTED]
To: [South East Anglia Link](#)
Subject: Sea Link (EN020026) – Request for Information Interested [REDACTED]
Date: 18 September 2026 15:21:33

[REDACTED] 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

Dear Secretary of State,

SEA LINK – THERE'S A CHEAPER, FASTER ALTERNATIVE

I am writing following your letter of 28 August requesting further information from several parties in relation to the Sea Link DCO.

Although I was not among the listed recipients, I am a registered interested party and would urge the Government to ensure that before any final decision is taken, there is an independent assessment of whether Sea Link represents value for money for the both the taxpayer and consumer.

Recent reports from Ofgem and the National Audit Office (Value for Money – Upgrading the Electricity Transmission Network), raise important questions about the cost, deliverability and value for money of major transmission projects such as Sea Link.

Ofgem has now assessed Sea Link at approximately **£3.2 billion – around three times the cost presented during the DCO Examination.**

This substantial increase raises serious questions about the reliability of the cost information presented during the Examination. National Grid presented an estimated project cost of approximately £1.1 billion, while Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) challenged that figure and submitted evidence suggesting that the true cost was closer to £3.2 billion.

There is however a potentially far cheaper and faster alternative that deserves proper independent assessment.

During the DCO Examination, SEAS submitted an alternative based on upgrading and reconductoring existing pylon corridors 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.

At a time of enormous pressure on public finances and household bills, a difference of this magnitude cannot simply be overlooked. Resources on this scale could instead support other pressing national priorities, including reform of the social care system and the consequent easing of pressure on NHS capacity.

The SEAS alternative could also potentially be delivered more quickly, while making greater use of existing infrastructure and avoiding much of the new onshore development, environmental damage and disruption to communities associated

with Sea Link.

I live in Aldeburgh, just south of the proposed Sea Link landfall. Having seen at first hand the scale of disruption to this nationally important landscape from the Sizewell C works, I find it difficult to understand why further major infrastructure and environmental damage should be accepted without first establishing whether an existing-corridor solution could meet the same network requirement more quickly and at a fraction of the cost.

Before consumers are committed to expenditure of £3.2 billion or more on Sea Link, I therefore urge the Government to commission an independent and transparent assessment of the SEAS alternative against Sea Link including cost, delivery timescale, network capacity and environmental impact.

Given the very significant difference in estimated cost, I believe such an assessment is essential before an irreversible decision is made.

Yours sincerely

Rosie Eisenstadt

Rosie Eisenstadt

