

From: [REDACTED]
To: [South East Anglia Link](#)
Subject: Sea Link (EN020026) Request for Information
Date: 18 September 2026 16:37:28

[REDACTED]

Dear Secretary of State,

Subject: Sea Link (EN020026)

Request for Information

LIONLINK - VALUE FOR MONEY FOR CONSUMERS

I write to you following your letter of 28 August requesting further information in relation to the Sea Link DCO. This was following reports from Ofgem and the National Audit Office, which raised significant and serious questions about the cost, deliverability, and value for money of Sea Link and the effectiveness of the current regulatory approach in protecting consumers.

I welcome the Government's commitment to reducing household energy costs. However, with billions of pounds being invested in energy infrastructure, it is **essential that related projects are necessary, proportionate and deliver value for money for consumers.**

The recent (11/09/26) National Audit Office (NAO) report - Value for Money – Upgrading the Electricity Transmission Network highlights weaknesses in the existing system which need to be addressed if the Great Grid Upgrade is to provide value for money. In particular **there must be stronger oversight, transparent monitoring, and sufficient regulatory capability to scrutinise costs.**

Importantly, the NAO also recommends that **Ofgem should assess the effectiveness of its regulatory approach in protecting consumers.**

These concerns are particularly relevant to Sea Link, the proposed 2GW transmission project through East Suffolk where Ofgem has now assessed costs at approximately **£3.2 billion – around three times the cost presented during the DCO examination.**

This increase from estimated project cost of approximately £1.1 billion **raises serious questions about the reliability and transparency of the information presented during the DCO Examination**, despite SEAS challenging the original figure and presenting evidence that the true cost was likely to be around £3.2 billion. In short, it was unrealistic.

Sea Link was developed around an assumed 1,852MW export deficit at Friston, associated with the proposed Nautilus interconnector. Nautilus was subsequently relocated away from Friston (before the Sea Link application was submitted), reducing the apparent deficit to approximately 352MW. **The circumstances underpinning Sea Link's original need have changed.**

Further Ofgem has identified issues which may require **additional works on the transmission network before Sea Link can operate compliantly at its intended 2GW capacity.** The precise scope and location have yet to be determined.

What is the true need and total cost? During the DCO examination, **Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) identified an alternative** to Sea Link based on upgrading and reconductoring existing pylon corridor. The estimated cost was under £300

million, potentially **saving consumers approaching £3 billion.**

The NAO's concerns also prompt renewed scrutiny of and **concern about LionLink**, National Grid Venture's proposed commercial multipurpose interconnector affecting the Suffolk coast.

Given the NAO's recommendations **the Government should require an independent and transparent reassessment of the economic need and consumer case for LionLink** against current 2026 evidence, rather than the 2024 regulatory decision. The latest proposed landfall site in **Walberswick (G3) is unsuitable**, as it was with the previous proposed sites at G & G2. with half of all village homes within five hundred metres with many closer.

This will mean.

- **Unacceptably high levels of noise, vibration, and light pollution for 2 years or more** with severe impacts from 24/7 HDD drilling.
- **Severe impacts on elderly residents, children and vulnerable** with significant disruption to **wildlife** on the protected habitats which lie in close proximity.
- **Severe traffic disruption and emergency evacuation risks** from use of the B1387 which is the sole access road for residents and tens of thousands of visitors.
- **Significant impacts on recreational tourism, and consequent threats to the viability of local businesses and jobs.**

Achieving Net Zero should mean establishing whether there are cheaper, better coordinated and less environmentally damaging alternatives.

Energy transition needs public support. That support will be much stronger if people can see that Government is challenging unnecessary expenditure, protecting consumers, and ensuring that the infrastructure being built is genuinely needed.

Regards

A F Whitehead

