Dear Sirs,

I am responding to your consultation as representative of Askam & Ireleth Parish Council

As stated in our response to National Grid we believe that their consultation on the NWCC was totally inadequate. There are glaring gaps in their documentation especially in the areas of traffic management and traffic impact assessment. Further the cost analysis on the alternatives costs seem to be designed to discount the options rather than to prove them as viable or otherwise. The Offshore routes from Kirksanton to the Fylde cost in particular do not seem to be sensible when compared to the tunnel costs, but also that NWCC has discounted the possibility of a sub sea link Kirksanton to Roose which would alleviate the issues around the Duddon Estuary but would also be considerably cheaper than the link to the Fylde cost. We feel that it needs to go back to NWCC as the initial consultation was based on incomplete information. Better to delay the project than get it wrong.

Question 1: Do you agree that there is a technical need for the project if Nugen's project goes ahead?

Yes

Question 2: Do you agree that connecting the Moorside site using four 400kV circuits is appropriate and compliant with SQSS requirements?

Not competent to judge

Question 3: Do you agree with our initial conclusions?

Yes

Question 4: Are there any additional factors that we should consider as part of our Initial Needs Case assessment?

Question 5: Do you agree with our view that:

(a) the overall project meets the criteria for tendering? (b) the potential sections meet the criteria for tendering?

Yes especially if the onshore alternative is taken up, as it would provide best value for the taxpayer.

Question 6: What are your views on our deliverability assessment for:

- (a) the overall project?
- a. Lagree
- (b) the potential sections?

In particular, considering our analysis of the design, procurement, and construction timelines as submitted by NGET.

Internal Only

a. I believe that the lack of detail in the consultation documents will result in an overrun in the detailed design stage and would inevitably have an overrun.

Question 7: What are your views on the need for overall coordination of the whole NWCC project if the project were to be split into packages with different delivery parties?

Programme management would absolutely be required to manage the whole end to end Project whatever the final solutions.

Question 8: If some, or all of NWCC were to be tendered, what, in your view, is the most appropriate allocation of risks across the relevant parties (TO, CATOs, and consumers)? How should these risks best be managed?

Risk should be with the TO and managed on a financial basis through the Programme Management Office.

Question 9: What are your thoughts on the substation modification and extension works at Harker and Middleton, in the context of efficient CATO delivery, including the options presented in this document?

No expertise to respond.

Regards

Mike Cumming

cummingm1@gmail.com

01229 468277

07854712489