

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.

I have followed closely the ecological impact concerns of both Sea link and the similar LionLink interconnector proposal with the Netherlands. Both have been unable to show they will be able to avoid significant impacts on red-throated divers within the offshore SPA, and to breeding, migrating and wintering birds, and other wildlife on terrestrial habitats, including the terrestrial SPAs, particularly Minsmere-Walberswick.

Recent independent reports have raised serious questions about the cost, deliverability and value for money of Sea Link and, more widely, the effectiveness of the current regulatory approach in protecting consumers. This compounds the issues relating to wildlife, as it provides evidence that none of it is necessary or a good economic option, even before the unacceptable ecological impacts are considered.

The Great Grid Upgrade is to provide value for money. Ofgem has now assessed Sea Link at approximately **£3.2 billion – around three times the cost presented during the DCO examination** and broadly similar to the cost predicted by Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS).

The circumstances underpinning Sea Link's original need have also changed. 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**. There is no need for Sesa Link, it is poor value for money, and it is environmentally damaging, impacting the most valuable protected sites in the UK.

SEAS identified an alternative based on upgrading and reconductoring existing pylon corridors, estimated to cost **under £300 million**, potentially saving consumers approaching **£3 billion**.

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.

I support offshore wind and the transition to Net Zero. However, achieving Net Zero should not mean accepting unnecessary expenditure or successive major infrastructure projects without establishing whether there are **cheaper, better coordinated and less environmentally damaging alternatives**.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Matthew Denny [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

18th September 2026