From: [redacted]
To: South East Anglia Link
Subject: National Grid - Sealink
Date: 18 September 2026 14:47:30

> You don't often get email from [redacted]@btinternet.com. Learn why this is important

Dear Secretary of State,

I am writing to you about the National Grid's proposed SeaLink subsea cable project linking Suffolk and Kent, part of the Great Grid Upgrade, which I understand is awaiting an imminent decision.

You will no doubt have had many letters setting out in detail the environmental impact these proposal would have on a fragile coastal landscape which is already facing the wide scale devastation caused by the construction of a new EDF nuclear power station Sizewell C near Aldeburgh, a new BSR solar farm at Kelsale which is under construction, and proposals by National Grid Ventures to bring power cables connecting the UK to Holland ashore at a greenfield site in the middle of Walberswick village. All major infrastructure projects within a few miles of each other along the coast, developed separately by different commercial entities with evidently little or no overall strategic oversight.

And now another one? If it weren't true it would be unbelievable.

No one would argue for a moment with the fact that we face an energy challenge that is unique to our times. Take it as read that it is a shared national and international challenge in which we are all invested in solving.

But coming back to SeaLink and even putting the environmental damage aside, as UK residents and tax payers we expect cost effectiveness as a basic criterion by which to judge such proposals.

So a few economic facts:

The estimated cost of the Sealink project has recently tripled from £1.1 billion to £3.2 billion.

Independent analysis shows that upgrading existing onshore pylon corridors instead would save at least £2.5 billion.

This alternative would cut costs by around £120 per UK household.

Outgoing National Grid CEO John Pettigrew took home an annual pay package of £6.5m, a record payout boosted from £6.1m by a performance bonus cap that was quietly doubled and funded directly by our rising electricity bills.

Given this Labour government's pledge to lower energy bills, does this look right? How can it justify approving a project that costs billions more than a viable, cheaper alternative? Value for money must be a crucial factor to safeguard struggling bill payers.

Your Sincerely,

John Morton

Blythburgh, Suffolk.