From: [redacted]
To: South East Anglia Link
Subject: Sea & lion link concerns
Date: 18 September 2026 22:38:03

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

Dear Secretary of State
I am a Suffolk resident and I have an enormous concern about both sea link & lion link. You've asked for feedback. Here is mine.

I work in the climate sector and I am fully onboard with the need for infrastructure to ensure a just transition to clean energy to ensure our energy security and to lower bills throughout the UK However when huge infrastructure projects are put in place we need to ensure it's the right solution.
I am extremely concerned about the escalating costs of these pipelines, and the environmental costs of bringing them onshore. From reading the proposals I do not feel that alternatives have been properly considered.
The National Audit Office's recent report, Value for Money – Upgrading the Electricity Transmission Network, makes this particularly important. I am therefore writing to ask the
Government to look closely at the proposed Sea Link project in East Suffolk, which appears to illustrate many of the concerns identified by the NAO.
Ofgem has now assessed Sea Link at approximately £3.2 billion – around three times the cost presented during the DCO examination. This raises serious concerns about the reliability and transparency of the information
presented during the Examination. National Grid presented an estimated project cost of approximately £1.1 billion, despite SEAS challenging that figure and presenting evidence
that the true cost was likely to be around £3.2 billion. Ofgem has now assessed Sea Link at approximately £3.2 billion, broadly confirming the figure put forward by SEAS. The £1.1
billion figure presented during the Examination therefore proved wholly unrealistic. It is deeply concerning that a project of this scale was examined without decision-makers and
affected communities being given a realistic assessment of its likely cost.
More importantly, the circumstances underpinning the original need for Sea Link have changed. The project was developed around an assumed 1,852MW export deficit at Friston (very close to my house) 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 are further concerns. Ofgem has identified unresolved harmonic issues which may require additional works elsewhere on the transmission network before Sea Link can operate
compliantly at its intended 2GW capacity. The precise scope and location of these works have yet to be determined. In addition, identified reinforcement between Richborough and
Canterbury in Kent is excluded from NGET's current £3.2 billion Project Assessment submission.

This raises a fundamental question: what is the true need and total cost to consumers of delivering Sea Link?
Most importantly, there is a cheaper, faster alternative.
During the DCO examination, Suffolk Energy Action Solutions (SEAS) identified an alternative
based on upgrading and reconductoring existing pylon corridor in Suffolk and Kent. This is estimated to cost under £300 million, compared with £3.2 billion for Sea Link – a potential
saving to consumers approaching £3 billion.

The alternative could also potentially be delivered more quickly, while making better use of infrastructure that already exists and avoiding much of the new onshore infrastructure,environmental damage and disruption to communities associated with Sea Link.

Furthermore, I would also like to emphasise that in addition to the overall case against
LionLink, the latest proposed landfall site in Walberswick (G3) is wholly unsuitable, as it was
with the previous proposed sites at G & G2. Homes sit directly adjacent on two sides of the
landfall site, with nearly half of all village homes within 500 metres with 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.• Impacts on elderly residents, children and vulnerable people will still be severe, along
with significant disruption to wildlife on the protected habitats which lie in close proximity.
• 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.
• Significant impacts on recreational tourism, and consequent threats to the viability of
local businesses and jobs.
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.

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; and
• coordinated offshore solutions and better use of existing infrastructure are fully considered.

With some consideration I think you can do better than this.

Regards
Sophie

Sent from my iPhone