

From: Glynis Porter
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 12:06
To: South East Anglia Link
Subject: Fw: Sea Link(EN020026) Request for Information

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]

The Rt Hon Miatta Fahnbulleh MP, Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero,
C/o: Energy Infrastructure Planning Delivery Team, DESNZ

Dear Secretary of State,

Sea Link, LionLink and value for money for consumers - there is a cheaper alternative

I am writing in light of the recent important reports from Ofgem and the National Audit Office, which raise serious questions about the cost, deliverability and value for money of SeaLink and, and more widely, the effectiveness the current regulatory approach in protecting consumers.

I understand the Government's commitment to reducing energy costs. It is essential that projects of this kind are necessary and important, but also that they are proportionate and provide genuine value for money for consumers. I am therefore writing to ask the Government to look again at the proposed Sea Link Project in East Suffolk, which appears to encompass many of the concerns identified by the NAO.

Initially, National Grid presented an estimated project cost of approx. £1.1 billion, despite SEAS presenting evidence that the true cost was likely to be around £3.2 billion. Ofgem has now assessed Sea Link at a similar £3.2 billion, which is 3 times the cost presented during the DCO examination.

I am very concerned that a project of this scale was examined in haste without decision-makers and affected communities being given a realistic assessment of its likely cost.

The project was developed around an assumed association with the Nautilus interconnected which has subsequently be relocated away from Friston reducing the apparent estimated deficit.

This raises the question of Sea Link's true need and cost to the consumers. **There is a cheaper, faster alternative.** SEAS identified an alternative based on upgrading and reconductoring an existing pylon corridor in Suffolk and Kent, offering a saving of around £3 billion. Also making use of infrastructure that already exists and avoiding much of the proposed onshore infrastructure, environmental damage and disruption to communities affected by Sea Link.

The latest proposed landfall site in Walberswick (G3) is definitely unsuitable. Homes sit directly adjacent on two sides of the landfall site, with nearly half of all village homes within

500 metres and dozens much closer. This means unacceptably high levels of noise, vibration and light pollution from construction work lasting for 2 years or more with severe impacts from 24/7 HDD drilling for weeks on end.

There will be major impacts on elderly residents, children and vulnerable people, along with significant disruption to wildlife on the protected habitats which are very close by. There will be severe traffic disruption and emergency evacuation risks arise from use of the B1387 which is the sole access road for residents and tens of thousands of visitors. There will also be major impacts on vital tourism, and threats to the viability of local businesses and jobs.

I support the transition to Net Zero and recognise that Britain's electricity network needs considerable investment, but this should not involve reckless spending on new infrastructure and destruction of an area of countryside made up of wildlife conservation, ancient woodlands and thriving villages, when the same network need can be met more quickly, less destructively and at a far lower cost by upgrading existing infrastructure.

In conclusion, I would like the Government to reassess LionLink's economic and consumer case using current evidence, and see if coordinated offshore solutions, and better use of existing infrastructure could be further considered.

Yours sincerely,

Glynis Porter

