

To: 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

Subject: Sea Link (EN020026) – Request for Information –

Dear Secretary of State,

SEA LINK, LIONLINK AND VALUE FOR MONEY FOR CONSUMERS

I am writing following your letter of 28 August requesting further information from several parties in relation to the Sea Link DCO. Although I am not a listed recipient, I write in light of two recent and significant reports from Ofgem and the National Audit Office, which raise 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 am of course in favour of reducing household energy costs. Billions of pounds are being invested in energy infrastructure, it is essential that projects are necessary, and provide genuine value for money for consumers.

The NAO highlights weaknesses in the existing system which need to be addressed if the Great Grid Upgrade is to provide value for money, transparent monitoring and sufficient regulatory capability to scrutinise costs.

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

This raises a fundamental question: **what is the true need and total cost to consumers of delivering Sea Link?**

The NAO's concerns about consumer protection must also prompt renewed scrutiny of **LionLink**, National Grid Ventures' proposed commercial multipurpose interconnector affecting the Suffolk coast. LionLink is not part of the Great Grid Upgrade. Ofgem expects LionLink to operate predominantly as an **export route from Great Britain to the Netherlands**, increasing GB wholesale electricity prices compared with the position without LionLink.

Given the NAO's recommendations, I urge the Government to require an **independent and transparent reassessment of the economic need and consumer case for LionLink against current 2026 evidence**, rather than continuing to regard that case as established by the 2024 regulatory decision.

The 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.

Before consumers and communities are committed to these projects, I therefore ask the Government to ensure that:

Sea Link's cheaper alternative is properly and independently assessed;

LionLink's economic and consumer case is reassessed using current evidence.

Coordinated offshore solutions and better use of existing infrastructure examined.

Personally, I would be grateful if the secretary of state would come and visit this small section of our Suffolk East Coast that is being destroyed by so many current projects. Our tourism is affected, our natural habitat is massively demolished, and we the local people devastated beyond words.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Lorraine Kay

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]