

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 12:03
To: South East Anglia Link
Subject: Fw: Sea Link (EN020026) Request for information IP number either [REDACTED] or [REDACTED]

to The Rt Hon Miatta Fahnbulleh MP

Dear Secretary of State

SEA LINK

I am writing in response to your letter of 28 August 2026 seeking further information from several parties in relation to the Sea Link DCO. I am not one of them but I have contributed to the full DCO hearings, and more evidence has come to light since then.

Briefly: Totally inadequate and misleading costings

No actual need (based on outdated calculations)

Security of national energy supplies -irresponsible concentration of supply points

First, the applicant said that the cost was likely to be £1.1 billion despite being challenged at the hearing. Now Ofgem have confirmed that challenge and estimated the cost to the nation at £3.2 billion. This tripling of the cost completely changes the assessment; particularly as it now appears plans made many years ago are way out of date. The whole project is now highly questionable.

Second, the need for this link is at best marginal. At the Hearing the calculations presented by participants showed that the Applicant's 'need' figures and capacity were miles apart. Is the project really needed: can it really provide value for money given there are alternative cheaper solutions such as upgrading existing network to accommodate the marginal amounts and at the same time reduce the overhead running costs by increasing throughput.

Third, it is becoming ever more apparent that East Anglia is the obvious location for missiles and bombs from Russia. It has to be an enormous security risk to have up to six wind farm supplied entry points on the coast within a 5-6 mile radius of Sizewell C. The threats from Russia cannot be ignored. It should not be given a sitting duck for taking out or disabling a significant chunk of the UK's electricity supplies with one or a couple of missiles. We need a widely spread network of supply points and lines to fragment the possibilities of aggression to disable energy supplies. Further, while the wind farm supplies are coming on land in Suffolk, almost all of the power has to go to where the population is densest, i.e. London (some 10 million people, a seventh of

the UK's population or over a quarter of England's population) and the Midlands. So, the national disruption in the event of an attack would be huge.

I accept that part of Suffolk's nationally valuable environment may need to be damaged in the national interest but a needlessly costly infrastructure project which is not needed and magnifies the security risk facing East Anglia, is not a price the nation should pay.

Alison Andrews