OFFICIAL

From: FAHNBULLEH, Miatta (MP) <[redacted]>
Sent: 17 September 2026 17:39
To: DESNZ Correspondence [redacted]>
Subject: Fw: Sealink (EN020026)

From: Suzanne Jansen <[redacted]>
Sent: 17 September 2026 4:56 PM
To: FAHNBULLEH, Miatta (MP) <[redacted]>
Cc: [redacted] SouthEastAngliaLink@planninginspectorate.gov.uk <SouthEastAngliaLink@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Subject: Sealink (EN020026)

[redacted]

Dear Secretary of State,

We hope you are well.

We live a few hundred yards away from the site of the proposed Converter Stations in Saxmundham.

If permission is granted I think you should know that we will be unable to sit in the small garden that we have due to the noise and dust that the construction will cause.

There will be lights, illuminating the sky 24/7 and we won't see the stars anymore or experience the darkness of night.

We also have our small town seriously affected by the traffic and workers at Sizewell.

Would you and your family like to experience that? The construction will take years to complete. As you well know nothing is quick in this country!

SEA LINK – THERE'S A CHEAPER, FASTER ALTERNATIVE

I am writing following your letter of 28 August requesting further information from several parties in relation to the Sea Link DCO. Although I am not a listed recipient, I feel compelled to write in light of two recent and significant reports from Ofgem and the National Audit Office,

which raise serious questions about the cost, deliverability and value for money of the proposed Sea Link project.

I welcome the Government's commitment to reducing household energy costs. With billions of pounds now being invested in the Great Grid Upgrade, it is essential that major projects are necessary, proportionate and provide genuine value for money for consumers.

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**, 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.

I support the transition to Net Zero and recognise that Britain's electricity network needs substantial investment. But achieving Net Zero should not mean spending billions of pounds on new infrastructure without first properly examining whether the same network need can be met **more quickly and at a fraction of the cost by upgrading existing infrastructure**.

Before consumers are committed to expenditure of £3.2 billion or more on Sea Link, I therefore urge the Government to ensure that the SEAS alternative is **independently and transparently assessed against Sea Link on cost, delivery time, network capacity and environmental impact**.

If a solution costing under £300 million can deliver the required network reinforcement faster than a £3.2 billion project, **surely it should be properly examined before billions of pounds of consumers' money are committed**.

Yours sincerely,

Suzanne and Peter Galpin

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.