

Dear Mr Norman,

I have detailed below my views on the current consultation into the SHE-T transmission link. I would be grateful if you could take my views into consideration when OFGEM makes its response to this flawed project.

Q1: It is obvious that the bigger the capacity of the transmission link, the more encouragement of development of new wind farms on the Shetland Islands. This would make the link more economically viable and reduce the end cost to the consumer.

As a resident living in close proximity to these wind farms, I do not feel that the fragile pristine landscape of the Shetland Islands can sustain any more than a small number of windmills to feed into the local grid. To approve the bigger transmission link would result in a flurry of wind farm applications, ultimately destroying our landscape and digging up vast volumes of peat, which is an essential carbon store.

Q2: It seems ironical that the oil and gas industries now want to use “green energy” to power oil rigs and their shore base. At the same time, they are extracting fossil fuels from the planet. I can not see that this is likely to happen and strikes me as being purely for a publicity stunt.

Q3: The sub sea cable linking Shetland to mainland UK is a really expensive way to secure the future of Shetland's energy needs. It is being developed primarily to carry the exported energy from Viking Energy windfarm, the idea of importing energy for local consumption, is a very recent idea. At a cost of approaching £1 billion, surely we have to look at other locally based alternatives- such as the LNG power station recently proposed.

The many failures in the Western Link cable (6 failures to date), highlight the need for a second cable. Without a second cable, Shetland will be without energy after a failure in the cable, for approximately 3 hours, until the back up local power station can be fired up. Ofgem need to ask the question to the workers at SSE Shetland power station at present, how they can foresee this being addressed. Having such lengthy power cuts for the entire islands would be catastrophic.

Q4: The costs of the link are highly likely to go over budget. The sea conditions over the route are very volatile and will present many challenges. The forecasted £700 Million, I believe to be at least 30% under estimated.

Q5: The CBA is of course weighted to favour the developer. If there is no cable, there will be no Viking Energy windfarm and the population of Shetland will have to look at smaller locally based green energy projects and at the much more economical option of an LNG power station.

Q6: Shetland is 180 miles north of Aberdeen. We are a unique beautiful group of islands in an amazing location. Surely to cover these islands with an industrial sized windfarm is not justified. The cost to the UK energy consumer will be huge, and to transmit energy both ways through a single sub- sea cable is a flawed idea. Energy should be provided to UK consumers closer to demand and not from these distant islands.

Q7: Viking Energy are pushing ahead with their plans to build their windfarm before any financial assistance has been agreed by the UK government. They are placing OFGEM in a position where they are being forced to approve the SHE-T link. VE will then be able to apply again for the Cfd grant

subsidy. Without this payment the project would be destined to lose money and be totally non-viable.

I hope that OFGEM will be able to see through this political blackmail and be able to look at the project independently and reject it – for the same reasons as in the last Cfd auction.

Q8: I do not agree with the findings of your analysis. There are still many questions to be asked. It is difficult when SSE are to gain financially from VE, SHE-T, Constraint payments and BM payments. SSE pull all the strings, and have a heavily vested interest in it all going ahead.

As I have said I do not feel it is in any way financially viable, and will destroy our fragile peat covered islands.

Q9: I have no views on the CPM.